R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 762 64

THE PREPLANNING TITLE VII CONFERENCE.

BY- KIEFFER, ROBERT DE
COLORADO UNIV., BOULDER

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VIIB-083 PUB DATE 20 NOV 59
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.32 33P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM PLANNING, TELEVISION, *RADIO, FILMS, *EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, *INSTRUCTIONAL FILMS, *REGIONAL PROGRAMS, *MEDIA RESEARCH, CONFERENCES, BOULDER, COLORADO

THIS REPORT IS A TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A PLANNING CONFERENCE HELD AT BOULDER, COLORADO IN SEPTEMBER 1958 FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNING A LARGER CONFERENCE IN APRIL 1960. SPECIFICALLY THIS WOULD DEAL WITH MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES IN THE MOUNTAIN PLAINS STATES OF ARIZONA, COLORADO, IDAHO, KANSAS, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NEW MEXICO, NORTH DAKOTA, OKLAHOMA, SOUTH DAKOTA, TEXAS, UTAH, AND WYOMING. (LP)

ED0037762

~~M.S. 500~~
8-083
OFFICIAL FILE COPY

THE

PRE-PLANNING

TITLE VII CONFERENCE

NOVEMBER 20, 1959

BOULDER, COLORADO

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE PRE-PLANNING TITLE VII CONFERENCE

November 20, 1959
Harvest House Hotel
Boulder, Colorado

ED003762

EDITED BY

Robert deKieffer

Director, Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction

and

Associate Professor of Education

University of Colorado

FOREWARD

Title VII of the National Defense Education Act, enacted on September 2, 1958, concerns itself with research and experimentation in more effective utilization in television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. Part A of the Title devotes attention to the need for experimentation in the use of these numerous media in improving educational opportunity. Part B is concerned with the dissemination of research findings for use in improving instruction in the classroom.

In cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education, a planning conference held at Boulder, Colorado was for the purpose of designing a conference to achieve these above-mentioned purposes for the states of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Colorado. At the Boulder planning conference, representatives of twelve of the states took steps to call a conference in April, 1960. At this April conference, persons interested in initiating research in use of the newer communication media and persons interested in the use of research findings will be brought together to discuss and design further efforts in the use of such media for the improvement of educational opportunities for American youth.

Dr. Elbie Gann
Colorado State Department
of Education
Denver, Colorado

TENTATIVE AGENDA

Pre-Planning Title VII Conference

November 19-20, 1959
Harvest House Hotel, Boulder, Colorado

Thursday, November 19

8:00 p.m. - Horizon Lounge - 5th Floor

Get Acquainted Session

Friday, November 20

9:00 a.m. - Horizon Lounge - 5th Floor

Chairman: Dr. Robert deKieffer, University of Colorado

EXPLANATION OF TITLE VII - ITS PURPOSES AND NEEDS

Dr. Walter Stone, U.S. Office of Education

DISCUSSION OF THE SPRING CONFERENCE

A. Objectives of the Spring Conference

1. Opportunities available under Title VII.
2. Methods of stimulating research.
3. Ways by which research findings can be disseminated.
4. Implementing research findings into practice.

B. What Type of Conference Should Be Held?

10:30 - Coffee Break

11:00 - B. What Type of Conference Should Be Held? (continued)

12:15 p.m. - Luncheon

1:30 -

Chairman: Dr. Elbie Gann, Colorado State Department of Education

C. Who Should Be Invited?

1. Type of representatives.
2. Need for speakers and for consultants.

D. Duration of the Conference.
E. What Are the Most Appropriate Dates?
F. What Type of Financial Assistance Would Be Needed to Insure Attendance?

2:30 - Coffee Break

G. Number From Each State.
H. Implementation of Conference Plans.

5:00 - Adjournment

TITLE VII - REGIONAL PLANNING CONFERENCE

Boulder, Colorado
November 20, 1959

Official Representatives

Mr. Richard H. Bell Director, Radio and Television	Arizona State University Tempe, Arizona
Dr. Elbie L. Gann Executive Assistant to the Commissioner	State Department of Education Denver, Colorado
Dr. Robert deKieffer Director, Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction	University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado
Dr. William W. Snyder Professor and Head Department of Communications	University of Idaho Moscow, Idaho
Mr. George Frey State Department of Public Instruction	Topeka, Kansas
Mr. Hardy D. Berry Director of Information and Head of TV and Film Department	Montana State College Bozeman, Montana
Dr. Wesley Meierhenry Assistant to the Dean Teachers College	University of Nebraska Lincoln 8, Nebraska
Mr. Joe Lawler Director of Information	State Department of Education Santa Fe, New Mexico
Dr. Leon Hibbs Director of TV Education	State Department of Education Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Mr. Robert Blake Director of Audio-Visual Education	Sioux Falls Public Schools Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Dr. Ernest Tiemann Director, Audio-Visual Instruction Bureau	University of Texas Austin, Texas
Dr. Alton P. Hadlock Director of Adult Education	State Department of Public Instruction Salt Lake City, Utah**
Dr. James McPherson Director, Distribution of Research	U. S. Office of Education Washington, D. C.

Dr. Walter Stone..... Director, Educational Media Branch	U.S. Office of Education Washington, D. C.
Miss Dorris L. Sander..... Consultant, Elementary Education	State Department of Education Laramie, Wyoming

** Unofficial Representatives

Miss Afton Forsgren ..... Assistant Director for Secondary Education	State Department of Public Instruction Salt Lake City, Utah
Mr. Daniel A. Keeler..... Director of Educational TV	State Department of Public Instruction Salt Lake City, Utah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Forward i

Conference Program ii

States Represented iii

I. OPENING SESSION 1

A. Explanation of Title VII--Its Purposes and Needs
Dr. Walter Stone, U.S. Office of Education 1

1. What is the NDEA? 2

2. Why was Title VII added to the NDEA? 2

3. What is Title VII? 3

4. Where does Title VII fit within the U.S. Office of Education? 4

5. What type of financial support is available? . . 5

6. How is financial support distributed? 5

7. What is the future of Title VII? 5

8. What type of conferences is the office holding? . 5

B. What type of conference should be held?
Dr. Robert deKieffer, Conference Co-Chairman 7

II. AFTERNOON SESSION 13

A. What type of conference should be held? (continued)
Dr. Elbie Gann, Conference Co-Chairman 14

B. When should the conference be held? 15

C. Who should be invited to attend? 15

D. What states should be invited to attend the spring conference? 19

E. How many people should be represented from each state? 19

F. Who should plan the spring conference? 21

G. What type of follow-up activities should be conducted? 22

H. What type of demonstrations should be given? 22

I. OPENING SESSION

Dr. Robert deKieffer, Conference Co-Chairman:

Dr. Elbie Gann, of the Colorado State Department of Education and I have called this conference to consider the feasibility of holding a larger conference next spring on Title VII of the National Defense Education Act. of 1958. Assembled here today are representatives from twelve Mountain-Plains states. I am sure that this group is completely competent and highly qualified to consider this topic. If we agree that a spring conference is advisable, it would become the responsibility of this group to find solutions to the following major problems:

1. What should be the objectives of a spring conference?
2. What type of conference should be held?
3. Who should be invited?
4. What should be the duration of such a conference?
5. What would be the most appropriate dates?
6. What type of financial assistance would be needed to insure attendance of key personnel?
7. How many persons should be invited from each state?
8. How could this spring conference be most effectively implemented?

Dr. Walter Stone, of the U. S. Office of Education, who is the mainspring behind this Pre-Planning Conference, will discuss: "Title VII of the National Defense Education Act, its purposes and needs."

Dr. Walter Stone, U. S. Office of Education:

I would like to discuss with you some of the background materials concerning Title VII, so that we may have a better understanding of this Title and its relationships to education. Some of the questions I would like to answer are as follows:

1. What is Title VII?
2. Where does it fit in the U. S. Office of Education?
3. Who are the people involved in this program?
4. What type of financial support is available?
5. What type of projects are currently underway?
6. What is the future of Title VII?

I would like to answer these questions and any others which you may wish to ask, because this conference today launches a program which we think

is going to be among our most important activities under the total Title VII program.

1. What is the NDEA?

I will not go back to the passage of the Law, but basically the National Defense Education Act includes an expenditure of slightly more than a billion dollars addressed to the following ideas:

1. It is designed to provide educational opportunities for a large number of people through fellowships, scholarships, and new educational programs.

2. It is designed to improve, implement, and strengthen our teaching in the areas of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and also provides the equipment and facilities to make this possible.

3. It is intended to provide for record keeping and special training programs to obtain a comprehensive picture of what is happening in American education. It is designed, in the case of the audio-visual field, or educational media field, to build in under some of our programs and practices, a sound concept of how these things can be utilized in making a contribution to modern education.

All of the titles under the National Defense Education Act contribute to these ideas in education. It all adds up to providing more education for individuals, more facilities and the necessary educational equipment, and the support of these activities with the necessary research, experimentation, and studies.

2. Why was Title VII added to the NDEA?

There was a vision which represented a great deal of thinking on the part of the framers of this bill. Behind this vision was the identification of new trends in education and the changes which were occurring. Influences on these trends included the problem of increased numbers of individuals desiring education and the inadequate facilities and machinery for providing quality education for these individuals. In addition there were new emphases within education which required that new vocational patterns be provided to meet the demands of the modern world. Another major problem was the shortage of teachers and the need for continuing growth of our current teachers through in-service training programs. Also, there seems to be a new shift in education itself, as a result of social changes and pressures. This shift was influencing the thinking of citizens and educators with respect to the implementation of these programs. Another factor was the resistance from the public to establish higher financial support levels for education. Finally, the general ineffectiveness of some kinds of teaching which was being done, the inefficient methods of communications which were being employed, and the educational failures which were highly dramatized in the press and elsewhere.

A number of proposed solutions have been advanced within recent years to help correct some of these deficiencies including the realignment of educational organizations. Among the most exciting are the new curriculum groups which have been developed on a National basis. We see new child study groups being organized for the purpose of improving education. Also, we see the development of new materials and methods. The concept of team teaching is on the horizon where the teaching job is divided among several people who are able to bring their specialties to focus on the instructional problems at hand. We are also getting at the problem of rate of learning with use of new techniques where students may travel at their own rate of speed through learning devices and similar techniques. Learning laboratories are being developed, including foreign language laboratories. In this complex is a different concept of the classroom of the future.

We, in education, are facing a number of basic social changes in our culture. They have their reflections and applications to education. We are now looking at the newer media to see if there are ways by which they can contribute to the improvement of education. Also, we are anxious to increase opportunities in education and make them better, more effective for our people in the years to come. The research and experimentation which is behind the concept of Title VII is designed to aid in the solution of some of these problems.

3. <u>What is Title VII</u>?

Title VII is addressed to three things. First, it includes research and experimentation and money to support it. Second, it is an information program. And third, it is a catalyst which we hope will provide opportunities and encourage the development of new, improved methods and techniques in using mass media.

Part A of Title VII is very specific. It states that with the money we have available, we are responsible for the development of <u>research programs</u> leading to the improved use of radio, television, motion pictures, video tape, filmstrips, and related media, including the printed page.

Three kinds of research proposals are being received under the Title VII program.

1. The utilization or adaptation of media or combinations of media for the improvement of instruction.

2. The improvement of teacher education in learning more about how to use media in education.

3. The utilization and adaptation of these media for the presentation of academic subject matter. This research is not limited to any specific subject matter area.

Our information or dissemination program has three major functions.

1. To conduct those studies, surveys, and inventories which will indicate areas in which more experimentation and research is needed.

2. To publish materials such as guide handbooks, manuals, bibliographies, texts, monographs; (in all media including the printed page,) which will help improve the use of the media.

3. To conduct conferences and demonstrations, furnish technical advisory assistance, and similar types of activities. This final function is the Commissioner's way of reporting to the nation on teaching programs and practices.

4. Where does Title VII fit within the structure of the U. S. Office of Education?

Title VII operates under the Office of Education as a branch of the Division of Statistics and Research Services. There are two main arms of this branch to parallel the law. First is the Research and Experimentation group with Warren Cipher as Senior Member. Second is the Dissemination and Services Division for which Jim McPherson is Chief. We work under the general supervision of an Advisory Committee composed of fourteen people. This is a statutory committee of which the Commissioner is legally chairman. This committee is composed of the following group of people.

a. One who represents liberal arts colleges.

b. Three practicing teachers or supervisors.

c. Three communications specialists.

d. Three TV specialists.

e. Three laymen.

This committee is responsible for recommending approval of research grant applications under Section A of Title VII, and for establishing the rank order in which these projects will be funded.

Research projects which are developed in the field come into the office, where they are screened by the staff and reviewed by experts in various parts of the country. They then go to our special Advisory Committee which recommends their approval, in order of their priority, to the Commissioner.

Section B of Title VII is the dissemination program. It operates as a contractual program in reporting research activities, teaching programs and practices, and related work. Although we welcome suggestions from the field the initiative for these contracts rests with the home office. The office will contract with an institution or organization for specific information on materials which they are desirous of having. The role of the Advisory Committee in Section B activities is to recommend approvals. However, the Advisory Committee does not have the statutory obligation for this section as it does with Section A.

5. What type of financial support is available?

The original bill authorized eighteen million dollars for the first year of operation. The first appropriation however included only five hundred thousand dollars during the fiscal year, 1959, to which was added one million, one hundred dollars, making the total one million, six hundred thousand dollars. During 1959-60, three million dollars has been allocated. We hope that the legal limit will be authorized during 1961 and 1962.

In 1959, the office obligated five and one-half million dollars. Of this amount, approximately three hundred thousand was for dissemination activities. In our future programming, it is logical to believe that the dissemination program will receive more financial assistance.

6. How is financial support distributed?

The office supported sixty-nine research programs and projects last year. We also supported fourteen or fifteen different types of dissemination activities. The office does not, nor does it intend to suggest the type of research projects which are submitted by individuals and institutions. We look to the field for ideas and projects which the field itself feels are important in this area.

Of the sixty-nine grants which were made, approximately one-half of them deal with educational television and/or its application. One cluster of grants in this area included the use of TV for teacher education (classroom observation) which made use of vidio tape, and kinescopes. A second cluster included the application and use of TV with home bound students, gifted students, and similar groups. A third cluster dealt with production techniques, including formats of presentation, use of the medium to the best advantage, and audience readiness.

The non-television projects included research projects dealing with the effectiveness of teaching machines and devices for self-instruction. A second type included the development and testing of all types of learning devices. Finally, were those projects dealing with the development and testing of new materials in terms of appropriateness for learning and teaching in many subject matter areas.

7. What is the future of Title VII?

This Bill has two more years to run, and obviously we must begin to report about the research which has been conducted to date. We are also going to have to conduct some follow-up studies to obtain more significant results. Finally, we will undoubtedly launch some new projects.

(Walter Stone used a series of overlays to indicate the type of research programs which were currently being supported and the areas in which additional research is necessary.)

8. What type of conferences is the office holding?

In the dissemination program of the office, we are currently concerned with three different types of conference techniques. One type will be a Research Review Conference designed to evaluate all communications

research conducted to date. Conferees will take a look at the type of research programs and projects which are being conducted under Title VII, the areas which need further study, and the direction which the projects seem to be taking. A Research Review conference will be held each year followed by the publication of a book which will include an up-to-date report on what has been done, where we are going, and what still needs to be accomplished.

A second type of conference which we will be holding is a series of regional conferences on teaching programs and practices. These conferences will include demonstrations of methods, materials and their utilization, and exhibits of new types of equipment. They are designed primarily to improve the in-service and pre-service training of teachers.

The third type of conference is that which we are here to discuss today. They will be designed to meet the objectives listed on our tentative agenda, which are:

1. What are the opportunities available under Title VII?

2. How can methods of stimulating research be carried forward?

3. What ways are most effective in disseminating research findings?

4. How can research findings be implemented into practice?

At this conference, I can forsee that the participants should include the following types of persons:

a. Producers of research. This group might include those research people who need to know more about the total program, and who may be stimulated to do research themselves or know the names of persons who would be interested in this type of research.

b. Consumers of research. This group might include school board members, teachers and administrators, who need to understand the significance of research and will improve the educational programs in their own communities through the use of newer media.

The problems which you face, as we see it, are:

1. How can we tell the story of newer media research, current research findings, and needed research to both producers and consumers of research that it will make a difference in American education?

2. Is the conference method an effective technique by which this information can be disseminated?

There are no restrictions imposed on this group in planning for a spring conference.

Dr. Alton P. Hadlock, Salt Lake City, Utah:

Is money going to be available for additional research projects?

Dr. Walter Stone:

There is adequate money available to start significant new projects under Title VII. I might add, however, that because of the limited available funds we are not duplicating research projects which are currently underway. We are limiting our current research to one of each type of project presented.

Miss Afton Forsgren, Salt Lake City, Utah:

Is there a directory of newer media research which has been completed to date?

Dr. Walter Stone:

This is the type of project which Dr. McPherson is currently developing. We sincerely hope that directories of abstracts will be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

Mr. Robert Blake, Sioux Falls, South Dakota:

Do any projects submitted and financed have to be terminated by 1962?

Dr. Walter Stone:

No. The funding would have to be obligated before June 30, 1962, but the completion of the project might extend eighteen months beyond this date.

B. What type of conference should be held?

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

We are gathered at this Pre-Planning Conference to consider ways and means of getting the producers and consumers of research together at a conference to determine if there is some action that can be taken which will make a difference in the improvement of instruction.

In the Mountain-Plains states, we have many problems including topography, regionalism, finances, and apathy. It is my belief, however, that we, as a group, can and will be able to rise above them and make a definite contribution in the implementation of Title VII through action. The problem for discussion then is: What type of a conference should be held?

Dr. Ernest Tiemann, Austin, Texas:

We have not been able to change people's attitudes about the conceptual structure of research. Although research is accepted on the academic level, the results of research really have not made a significant difference on the part of the consumer for whom it is really designed. Many of our teachers have a highly academic attitude toward

research. We have not yet found the bridges which we can build between academic research and classroom practice.

Dr. Leon Hibbs, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma:

Two groups of people which we must approach along with the teachers are the school administrators and school boards. These groups do not seem to recognize the importance of research and how it can be applied. Many people in these two groups are not taking advantage of the findings of research which have already been conducted.

Mr. Joe Lawler, Santa Fe, New Mexico:

We might approach the planning of the spring conference from the dissemination angle; namely, bringing together groups of people for whom research programs have been designed.

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry, Lincoln, Nebraska:

One of the basic problems is a concept which we hold about education, teaching and learning, and the type of setting in which it must occur. Everyone in education seems to be willing to conduct research as long as it implies that one teacher is in a self-contained classroom with twenty-five or thirty youngsters. This same teacher imparts all information and conducts all other activities. Educators, as a general rule, are still thinking about the types of classroom designs, their physical relationships, and a concept about the teacher which is no longer tenable. With the explosion of man's knowledge, it is impractical to believe that any one teacher can keep up with all of the developments in the modern world. We must start the conference with a discussion on the basic question; namely, "What is education?" This discussion will then bring into sharp focus new ways, ideas, materials, and equipment which can be utilized for educational purposes. Then we can discuss: what the research shows us relative to the implementation of education in the self-contained classroom?

Dr. Walter Stone:

In most of the studies which have been conducted to date, the learning theory has been taken into consideration. Learning machines, television and other equipment are only means of implementing these processes.

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

I would like to suggest a Gestalt approach to the spring conference. We should begin with the big picture; namely, the type of learning environment which we should provide our youngsters. Then all of the learning devices and techniques become means of achieving educational goals and objectives. This would become the rationale for bringing into the conference, information concerning the research which has been conducted to date, relative to mass media, and the need for additional research. In this way, we can get our story told to teachers,

administrators, researchers, college professors, and other persons involved with the educational processes of our country.

Mr. Hardy D. Berry, Bozeman, Montana:

Would you include in the big picture subject matter content only, or would you also include ideas, developments of attitudes, and the social development of pupils?

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

Obviously, I would include all aspects of the learning environment which have any influence on desired outcomes.

Mr. Daniel A. Keeler, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wouldn't it be possible, under the spirit and the letter of the law of Title VII, to develop a research project which would utilize the concept just presented through new electronic media to determine the possibility of developing new teaching methods and techniques?

Dr. Walter Stone:

Yes. This is practically the nature of our self-teaching devices research which is underway. Such studies might be concerned with subject matter, while others would be concerned with new teaching media and devices. We need and want creative, imaginative thinking providing it will benefit free public education.

Dr. Elbie Gann, Colorado State Department:

In our planning for this coming conference, we must also concern ourselves with directing the thinking of teachers along the avenues of utilizing the electronic tools currently at our disposal. The development of the best electronic equipment and the most effective research, will accomplish little if they are not utilized by teachers in the classroom where the real test of learning takes place.

Dr. Richard H. Bell, Tempe, Arizona:

We must also consider the question; "What is the reason for the cultural lag between research and its utilization in teaching and learning situations?"

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

One of the basic problems seems to be in the method by which the normal classroom teacher receives the findings of research. Often they are presented to the individual teacher in isolation. It would be interesting if some school system could take the findings of research as a basic core for the development of a new and different approach to curriculum and curriculum planning.

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

One method of getting research findings to classroom

teachers is through the various state organizations of the Classroom Teachers Association. Each of these individual state groups has a research committee which is working on the dissemination of research findings to their membership.

Mr. Robert Blake:

Most teachers have a difficulty of wading through mountains of research studies to determine those which have a relationship to her personal classroom problems. Often, research findings do not broaden a teachers perspective, but narrows down channels of thought. Many teachers do not have a constructive attitude concerning research.

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

We should use all of the means at our command, particularly the mass media, as methods of disseminating information in a condensed fashion. This would tend not to isolate the teacher, but would place him in relationship to the total population and its interest and need for the findings of research.

Mr. Joe Lawler:

There are two items which must definitely be considered as important segments of the spring conference. These are: first, the problems of disseminating research findings; and, second, the problem of finding ways to implement research findings into practice.

Dr. Walter Stone:

It would be important to invite one of the experts who is working with learning machines to discuss how these instruments are being used. It might stimulate further learning machine research on college campuses and in schools in the Mountain-Plains region.

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

I would like to shift our thinking for a moment to the reason why teachers are apprehensive concerning the newer media of communications. They are still thinking of themselves as doing the entire job of teaching. Actually, they never have; because, as soon as the textbook was developed it carried the main message. We have come to accept the printed page as not being a threat to the security of the classroom teacher. Television, however, represents a threat. In most schools where television is being used, a great deal of time is spent reassuring teachers that they are still in charge of the learning environment. Often, television teaching is of little value because of teachers attitudes and their fear of the newer media. Teaching machines, the motion picture, the filmstrip, and other media are in the same category as television. Teachers do not see their role as the guider and director of instruction, even though this role calls for the most expertness and understanding of human growth and development. The teachers job, then, is becoming that of a synthesizer; a director of learning experiences. This is the job which humans can do so well.

The fault lies to a large extent with the teachers colleges, one of

which I represent, in continuing the notion that the teacher must have all of the responsibility for doing everything. She never had it, and certainly with the accumulation of knowledge in the future, she will not physically be able to do it. Teacher education college faculties, administrators, supervisors, and teachers must view education of the future in ways in which they have never seen it before.

The moment that the U. S. Office approved of the first research study dealing with learning machines, a certain assumption was made about a type of classroom and the role of the teacher of the schools in the future. For this reason, I believe that the first series of presentations at the spring conference should deal with what the future education is likely to become.

Dr. James McPherson, U. S. Office of Education:

The average classroom teacher is not the person who will be synthesizing all of the research findings and put them into action. Between the researcher and the teacher will eventually appear another group; namely, a team, including psychologists, sociologists, structual linguists, communications specialists, and others. This group will come together to develop specific teaching programs to accomplish desired outcomes. They will be developing systems of teaching and learning and providing them to classroom teachers. The MIT Physics Project, and the AIBS Project are examples. These groups are developing systems of teaching materials for classroom use. Teachers themselves do not have the time, effort, or determination to evaluate all of the research findings and apply them to the learning-teaching situation.

Mr. Joe Lawler:

There are many avenues of dissemination which should be considered. We must find ways by which we can get educators off of the dirt roads and on to super highways. This might be accomplished through our teacher-training institutions, through in-service training programs, through existing publications, and existing professional organizations. State departments of education can do much in the dissemination process. We must find the most effective avenues for disseminating this vital information.

Miss Afton Forsgren:

We should include the classroom teachers in our spring conference. They are usually brought in at the wrong end of research projects. Resistance is often built up in teachers against research and experimentation because they feel that their security is at stake. When teachers realize that newer media of communications and newer educational techniques will actually free them from menial jobs and give them a greater opportunity to teach, the resistance melts away.

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

Salesmanship is one of the vital aspects in the utilization of research findings. However, all salesmanship and the sale of products results from a felt need. In my estimation, it makes good sense to invite the classroom teachers to the spring conference. They can also discuss the needs of modern education.

We have said that modern education is not adequate. If this is true, the classroom teachers themselves must be appraised of the inadequacies and become a part of the team to determine ways and means of improving the situation. Then we can all discuss the techniques which are applicable to satisfy the objectives of education.

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

The P.T.A. is another organization which we should include. It is constantly looking for exciting new program materials to channel into local meetings. If we could excite and involve P.T.A. representatives in the spring conference, they might consider this topic vital enough to be considered as an emphasis program for dissemination to all P.T.A. groups.

Mr. Hardy Berry:

We must, in any conference of this nature, involve certain administrative personnel. They are the ones who control the purse strings for financing education to the local level and also financing teacher-training programs in our institutions of higher learning.

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

We must also determine what we can do in our own thirteen states, both preceding and following the spring conference. It is important that we consider how to implement these discussions in our own states.

Dr. William Snyder, Moscow, Idaho:

Any conference is only the beginning of dissemination. We should, therefore, consider the development of built-in, follow-up activities which will insure effective follow-up.

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

Dr. Elbie Gann has been keeping a list of the important ideas which we have been discussing. I would appreciate it if he would report on his observations.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

I have tried to synthesize the main ideas and concerns which have been presented this morning and the objectives which we might seek to achieve at the spring conference.

1. Consider the development of tools and facilities to meet future educational needs.

2. Attack the problem of ways by which people learn. Consider the functions, role, and activities of the teacher in the learning process.

3. Bridge the gap between the researchers who develop research projects and the classroom teachers who use the research

findings. Bring some of these people into face to face contact at the conference.

4. Discuss methods of dissemination of research findings and methods of implementing these findings into practice.

5. Involve a broad range of people including classroom teachers, administrators, P.T.A. officers, professional educators, etc.

6. Consider types of follow-up activities which are possible in each state to stimulate:

   a. New and important research projects.

   b. Utilization of research findings.

7. Include discussions on the direction and coordination of University research projects on a state or regional basis.

8. Survey the areas of needed research to fill in the gaps of the utilization of newer media for educational purposes.

9. Describe the format of good research design including adequate controls.

10. Consider the development of a research council in each state to assist individuals, groups, and/or organizations in developing adequate research projects and writing proposals.

These are some of the major considerations raised this morning.

12:20 Meeting Adjourned. (Noon Recess)

II. AFTERNOON SESSION

Dr. Elbie Gann, Conference Co-Chairman:

During the morning session, we considered the problem of objectives of the spring conference. There are several additional questions to which we should address ourselves this afternoon. These are:

A. Should we hold a Spring Conference on Title VII?

B. What type of conference should be held?

C. Who should be invited?

D. What should be the duration of the conference?

E. What are the most appropriate dates?

F. What type of financial assistance would be needed to insure attendance?

G. How many participants should be invited from each state?

H. How can the conference plans best be implemented?

I would like to invite discussion on Item B.

A. What type of conference should be held?

Dr. Leon Hibbs:

We should have a conference in which everyone in attendance is personally involved in some type of activity. In order to accomplish this, two, or more persons should give major presentations. We could distribute their prepared papers and other resource materials prior to the conference.

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

I would like to suggest a format for the conference; 1. general sessions, 2. discussion sections, and 3. reporting sections of the discussion group meeting. This would provide feedback to the entire group. This might even be accomplished by dividing the conference into state groups, so that their discussions would be considered in terms of their own state situations.

Dr. Leon Hibbs:

This technique might be advisable; however, mixing of the groups would also be beneficial.

Mr. George Frey, Topeka Kansas

I envision the first day of the conference as being devoted to a discussion of what is happening in the field then breaking into smaller groups for discussing these key issues. A second day might be devoted to demonstrations of newer teaching machines and similar devices including discussion on the ways in which they can be used in teaching. Then again, break up the group into discussion sessions. Finally we could break up into group by states to consider methods, ways and means of implementing the dissemination of this information within each state.

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

On the first day of the conference, we might have a presentation on the entire theory of learning. A second presentation might be directed to the implications of these theories of learning to modern education in terms of the teacher, school facilities, materials and equipment. These would be two kinds of motivational presentations. In the afternoon, the conference might be structured into groups consisting of teachers, administrators, supervisors and others, concerning the implications of these topics in their own areas.

A second day might be devoted to the specifics of teaching machines, learning laboratories, and the entire area of automation in education with demonstrations and devices. The second afternoon could be structured differently than the first, by breaking into discussion groups by states. These discussions would revolve around the question of what these research findings and techniques mean to our own local schools.

It would seem advisable to structure the groups in different ways at different times for cross fertilization of ideas. The third morning session might be devoted to the problem of where are we going in the research field, how can we improve research, and how can we disseminate the findings of research. The third afternoon might consider the problem of how can we implement research findings into action?

Dr. James McPherson:

Prepared papers of the major presentations given at a conference should be disseminated in advance. In this way, the participants will be ready for the presentations and bring pertinent questions for discussion. This telescopes the time needed in obtaining fruitful discussions.

Mr. Hardy Berry:

To back up a bit, I believe that there is total agreement that a spring conference of this nature is advisable; however, we should have a formal motion on this issue.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

The question has been asked, should we have a Title VII Conference in the spring? (The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.)

B. When should the conference be held?

The passage of this motion seems to indicate that we should go immediately to Item E concerning the most appropriate dates for holding such a conference.

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

You should request each representative to supply you with a calendar of the educational activities within each of their states. I am sure that you have a calendar of all national events. With these data, you would then be in a position to set the most appropriate dates for the spring conference. This could be done by correspondence. (Each representative agreed to submit to Dr. Gann their state calendar and suggested appropriate dates for holding the spring conference.)

C. Who should be invited to attend?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Let us consider for a moment question C, Who should be invited to this conference?

Dr. Walter Stone:

Through our discussion so far, we have identified several groups of participants; namely, the producers of research, enlightened laymen or consumers, and administrators.

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

One of our basic problems revolves around the problem of the producers of research not always being in tune with the users of research. It might be advisable to have both groups involved in the conference. The users of research must understand what the producers of research are contemplating and conversely the producers of research must understand the problems faced by the users of their research findings. (Dr. Gann asked Dr. Meierhenry to draw on the board an outline of content which might be covered at the spring conference. He also asked Dr. deKieffer to outline the types of people who might be invited to the conference. These two outlines were then used as points of departure in the discussion that followed.)

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Let us discuss the outline which Dr. Meierhenry has placed on the board and come to specific agreements of the entire group, in order to develop a concensus.

Program ideas presented by Dr. Meierhenry:

I. What are the learning problems?

   a. Learning theories

   b. New directions in education

II. What are the implications in the direction of the role of education?

   a. Teachers

   b. Facilities, classrooms, materials centers, etc.

III. What is the role of the newer media as related to new directions in education?

   a. Learning machines

   b. Television

   c. Other systems

IV. What are the implications of media research for learning and teaching?

   a. Organization

   b. Facilities, equipment

   c. Teachers

V. What is involved in determining research needs, its dissemination and utilization?

   a. Types of research needed

   b. Methods of dissemination

   c. Implementing research into action

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

A conference of this type cannot always stay with generalities. It must eventually come down to specifics. This can be done only after you have put it in the appropriate setting. I would venture to guess that ninety-nine per cent of the people in Nebraska have never heard of a teaching machine. This, however, is one of the hottest issues on the horizon and may jar us out of our complacency, particularly when we consider the rationale of the first day in discussing the problems of learning and teaching, the role of the teacher in education, and the equipment and facilities necessary for education of the future. Later in the conference when we discuss the implications of media research, we will have a focus point upon which to direct our attention.

I conceive of each sections as being half-day sessions. Roman numeral I, the learning problems, including learning theories and new directions in education, I conceive of being a morning session. Roman numeral II would be a discussion session etc. (Active discussion followed Dr. Meierhenry's presentation and resulted in slight re-organization and word changes. It was agreed that the specific wording of the final program would be left to the Co-Chairman to work out.)

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Now that we have agreed upon the areas in which should be covered in the program, let us turn our attention to the persons who should be invited to attend the spring conference. These are:

1. Producers of research
2. Technicians of production
3. Users of research findings
4. Professional and the lay groups
5. Attitude formers

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

In discussing persons identified as producers of research, are you considering people in communications research, or are you considering primarily producers of research in subject matter areas?

Dr. Walter Stone:

We are concerned with those people who are interested in doing research in the media field, whether they are subject matter oriented or media oriented.

Mr. Robert Blake:

I would like to see representatives from school board associations and our P.T.A. groups attend a conference of this nature,

as well as administrators of public supported institutions of all types. It would be a revelation for them to see this type of conference in action, as well as seeing some of the abbreviated reports of what research has shown.

Mr. Daniel A. Keeler:

Where do the curriculum people fall in the list of types of persons to be invited?

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

They would fall under the classification of theorists; however, I might hasten to add that I hope we will not be over-loaded with curriculum people at this conference, because many of them are still print oriented and clock oriented.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

The type of curriculum people we want at this particular conference are those who would assist with the implementation of ideas into practice.

Dr. James McPherson:

I am pleased to report that there are a few people in the curriculum field, particularly those working on the Commission on Instruction of the A.S.C.D., who are much more aware of the importance of all types of instructional materials than most of the persons with whom we have had contact in the past.

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

I can foresee that in many of these categories we would, of necessity, have to import consultants for this conference who would assist in laying the ground work for discussions. These consultants could then sit with the discussion groups for the discussional part of the conference. All of the reporting should be functional, rather than static, not just reporting on specific research projects which are currently underway.

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

We ought to consider the major presentations in terms, not of media, but in terms of problems which can be solved through various media. In this way, we will avoid any particular presentor from riding a hobby. We might even consider research reporting by teams so that no particular media is advanced over another. We can avoid criticisms, therefore, as being media centered.

Mr. Robert Blake:

Do you consider that attitude formers are also interpreters?

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

Yes.

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

We ought to include professional magazine editors in the educational field, such as state association editors, and the like.

Mr. Hardy Berry:

We should also include school board association members, who would be considered under attitude formers. Under producers of research, shouldn't we also include the creative individual who is not too directly related to research production?

D. What states should be invited to attend the spring conference?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

There are a number of other questions which we must answer before the end of the day. The first one is: Are the twelve states, plus Colorado, those which most logically should be invited to participate in the spring conference? I might add that there is nothing sacred about the organization which we have developed for this Pre-Planning Conference. The decision remains with this group as to whether the states which we selected originally should be included in the spring. (A roll call by states was then held with a request for a "yes", "no", or don't know".)

There is a unanimous feeling that the states which have been selected should be invited to participate in the spring conference.

E. How many people should be represented from each state?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

The second question is: How many people should be represented from each state?

Mr. George Frey:

The number of people to be invited would depend, to a great extent, on the amount of financial support available to bring them to such a conference.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Is some Federal support absolutely imperative to insure representation from your state? Is there any possibility of matching funds or effort from your states, by which you could send representatives to this conference?

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

Experience has shown that if financial assistance is available, it will insure procuring the persons you want for a conference.

Usually, this type of person is most influential and effective when he returns to his own state. The persons invited to participate in the spring conference should understand that they must perform a leadership role in carrying out additional activities when they return home.

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

We should agree to go back to our states and hold a pre-planning conference similar to this one. In this way each state group would be responsible for the selection of persons to be invited to the spring conference. Local leadership would be assured.

Dr. Wesley Meierhenry:

Transportation is a serious problem for the majority of people. If there was some way whereby we could get transportation allowance, conferees are usually able to pay their own room and board.

It may also be possible for state groups to travel together by doubling up in automobiles. This would free some of the travel monies for room and board.

Dr. Leon Hibbs:

There are some groups in our state which could well afford to financially assist their representatives. There are others which cannot. I don't believe we can make an across-the-board ruling until we have selected the representatives.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

It might be possible to designate official representatives for whom financial support would be forthcoming and then a group of unofficial representatives who might be able to supply their own funds.

Dr. Alton Hadlock:

It is often difficult to get state monies for out-of-state travel, regardless of the worthiness of the cause.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Now, let us return to the question, How many persons should be invited from each state?

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

In looking over the groups which we have agreed upon as being important to the conference, I believe we should consider the possibility of having eight representatives from each state.

Mr. Richard Bell:

As I count up the number of categories we have and consider our state, I would suggest that twelve be sent from Arizona.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Some of the theorists and designers of research would fall into the consultant group. We would not necessarily include this type of person from each state. This would allow for a better distribution of people coming from each state.

Dr. James McPherson:

We must keep in mind, that the spring conference will be research oriented, and therefore, the persons who are invited to come should also have such orientation.

Dr. Ernest Tiemann:

I would like to challenge that statement. It is not only the media research specialists who should be included in this conference, but persons interested in dissemination. If you want things to happen with the results, we must also consider including disseminators.

Dr. James McPherson:

At the spring conference we are interested in dissemination of research and with improving the quality of research. Therefore, we should also involve the key people who are responsible for research.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

This discussion has been most helpful and will give direction to our thinking in terms of the planning for the spring conference. I would like to request each of you to send us the following information.

1. An estimate of what it would cost to bring your key people to Colorado.

2. The names of persons to be invited.

3. Short statement on each representative's background and reasons for attending the conference.

4. The number of persons that you feel should be invited from your state.

F. Who should plan the spring conference?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

Another important question to which we would like an answer is one dealing with organization. Do you believe it would be advisable to establish an executive committee for this group to plan the spring conference, or would you prefer to leave the organization to the Colorado group?

Dr. William Snyder:

I would like to see a group of local people here in Colorado work out all final details.

(It was moved and seconded that the Colorado group develop the final plans for the spring conference. The motion was carried unanimously.)

Dr. Walter Stone:

I would like to take the Colorado people off the hook by stating that the U.S. Office will finance this conference up to the limit of its capacity, but it may not be possible for the Colorado group to include all of the recommendations that have been given here today.

G. What type of follow-up activities should be conducted?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

What type of follow-up activities will be conducted in each state, either following up this conference, and/or the spring conference?

Dr. Robert deKieffer:

It might be advisable, when we go back and hold our pre-spring conference meeting, to discuss this item in terms of the local scene.

Mr. Hardy Berry:

I plan to return to my state and report this meeting to the superintendent of public instruction. I am sure that he will call a meeting to discuss the spring conference, at which time we will be in a position to send you the information you want.

H. What type of demonstration should be given?

Dr. Elbie Gann:

A final question that should be asked relates to consultants, speakers, demonstrations, and similar activities at the spring conference. Should we consider the inclusion of demonstrations of some types of the newer teaching and learning devices?

Dr. James McPherson:

I was at a recent conference where the people did not even start discussing items along the same lines until after they had seen a demonstration of the learning machine. The ensuing sessions were much more informative.

Mr. Hardy Berry:

We should go one step further and indicate that while these things are currently possible, they are not the ultimate type of equipment and facilities which we will have in the future. We don't want to stagnate the conference and limit it only to current potentials.

Mr. Joe Lawler:

Certain basic demonstrations should be given if we have somebody who is involved in the research with these devices. He

might describe their use and effectiveness.

Dr. James McPherson:

Demonstrations should be given which would show the operation of learning machines and the materials which can be programmed in it, rather than just showing a specific type of equipment.

Mr. Richard Bell:

It would be tremendously exciting to have a demonstration of the classroom of the future, in which the participants would become students so that they could see at first-hand how these things are used.

Dr. Elbie Gann:

If there is no further discussion, I declare this meeting officially adjourned.